

REPATRIATION OF B.D.O.'s

131 SRI MAHADEVA BANKAR (Byadagi).—

Will the Minister for Development be pleased to state :—

(a) Whether it is a fact that the Government intends to repatriate the Block Development Officers to their parent departments;

(b) if so, the steps the Government has taken to protect the status, emoluments, service conditions of these officers in their departments when they are repatriated ?

SRI P.M. NADGOWDA (Minister for Development).—

(a) Government are considering the extent to which the staffing pattern under Community Development should be modified and the manner in which the posts under Community Development Officers, to the parent Departments could be taken after the general question referred to above is finalised.

(b) Does not arise in the light of the Reply to clause (a).

NOTICE OF PRIVILEGE MOTION BY SRI K. H. PATIL AGAINST THE MINISTER FOR DEVELOPMENT

SRI K. H. PATIL.—Sir, on 20th March 1970 there was some speech by the Hon. Minister for Co-operation wherein he had made some allegations against me. I have given notice of a privilege motion. I want to know whether you have given consent to move the said privilege motion.

MR. SPEAKER.—With respect to the notice of privilege motion given by the Hon. Member Sri. K. H. Patil, I am to inform the House, that the matter was discussed with the Hon. Minister for Co-operation and the hon. Member Sri K. H. Patil. The Hon. Minister explained that he had not made any allegation against the hon. Member. The Hon. Member Sri Patil also explained that he had no intention to insult the Hon. Minister. In view of this, the question of giving consent to the notice of privilege motion does not arise.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—Sir, I particularly bring to your notice the proceedings of that particular day wherein he has made certain allegations. I will forward these relevant records to the Hon. Chair.

(Sri K. H. Patil)

The Hon. Chair may kindly consider the statement and order for expunction of the same from the records.

Expunction to the statements which are in consistent with the dignity of the House.

MR. SPEAKER.—I shall consider the statements made both by the Hon. Minister for Co-operation and the hon. member. The statements which are not in consistent with the dignity and decorum of this House will be expunged from the records.

MR. SPEAKER—Next item.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—Before proceeding to the next item, I would like to raise a point of order. My point of order is that yesterday after the papers were laid on the Table of the House some more business was taken up for consideration by this House at about 6.55 P.M. or so. Myself and several other hon. members staged a walk-out in protest against the action of the Government in delaying the laying of rules on the table of this House. The House was to have adjourned at 6 P.M. and there was no further extension of the sittings also, I felt no further agenda should have been taken up for consideration. Therefore whatever business was transacted after that, may be deleted from the proceedings and the same be taken up to-day.

SRI M. N. RAMANNA.—Sir, at about 6.30 P.M. the time was extended by the Chair till 7.00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—The position is that only the time of commencement of the day's sittings is mentioned in the list of business. As a matter of convention the House is being adjourned at 6.00 P.M. Further, the time was extended till 7.00 P.M. as pointed out by hon member Sri M. N. Ramanna.

Discussion of the annual financial statement of the MSEB for 1970-71. Motion to consider (debate continued).

SRI H. SIDDAPPERAPPA.—Sir, I find that yesterday dated 3rd April 1970 the Hon. Chief Minister appears to have made a speech on the floor of the House in regard to the Electricity Board. I want to know whether actually did so?

MR. SPEAKER.—The speech copies were circulated to the members. The Hon. Chief Minister read only one para of his speech. Since printed copies of the speech were placed on the table and in order to save the time, the rest of the speech was taken to have been read.